

Remarks

In the Office Action dated August 20, 2003, the Examiner withdrew all previous objections and rejections. The Examiner objected to claim 25. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 5-7, 10-11, 17-19, 21-22, 24-25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the patent document in the name of Gau (WO01/83674A1). The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 10 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by the U.S. Patent in the name of Inoue, et al. 5,955,352. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by the patent document in the name of Gratzl, et al. (WO98/13675A1). The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by the U.S. Patent to Gumbrecht, et al. 5,376,255. The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by the U.S. Patent to Stanzel, et al. 6,440,296B1. The Examiner rejected claims 39-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Gau in view of the U.S. Patent to Lev, et al. 5,403,462 and Karube, et al. 4,975,175. The Examiner rejected claims 3-8, 10-14 and 17-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the U.S. Patent to Gumbrecht, et al. 5,376,255. The Examiner rejected claims 3-7, 10-14 and 17-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Stanzel, et al. 6,440,296. The Examiner rejected claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Gumbrecht, et al. and further in view of Reincke, et al. 6,251,567. The Examiner rejected claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Stanzel, et al. and further in view of Reincke, et al. The Examiner noted that claims 23 and 42-46 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Since claim 23 is already in independent claim, there is no need to rewrite this claim. Claims 42 and 43 have been rewritten as suggested by the Examiner.


Applicants' Attorney intends to file one or more additional applications to pursue the cancelled/withdrawn claims in view of the prior art.

Consequently, in view of the above and in the absence of better art, Applicants' Attorney respectfully submits the application is in condition for allowance which allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert W. Hower, et al.

By



David R. Syrowik

Reg. No. 27,956

Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: November 19, 2003

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351